la	UNN WINIOU ESE 4:16-00-00603-HSG Document 7 Filed 03/03/16 Page 1 of 7
j	trescent City, Ca 95532  FILED
2	MAR 03 2016
3	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALLERY
4	UNITED STATED DISTRICT LOVER (
5	NORTHERN DIST. OF CALIFORNIA
6	
7	William E. Brown, Jr. (K. M.G.E.) NO. CVIB 603
8	Plainstiff MOTION FOR THE
q	V. APPOINTMENT OF
10	Robert Lasocco CRM, marden C.E. Ducart, COUNSEL OR ASSIGNMENT
1	T. Amis R. LT. Kirby, Alex Valviski, Circly  ox, Cloj. Taylar, Clo L. Butieriez, LT. T.
	Buchanow et al Defendants  Legal Mediation Team et al regarding THE Agreement To End All Hostilities etc
12	15 43 USIC \$1181 Dets 2
13	PLAINTIFF BROWN PURSUANT TO \$1915, REQUESTS THIS COURT TO
14	APPOINT COUNSEL TO REPRESENT HIM IN THIS CASE FOR THE
15	FOLLOWING REASONS.
16	1. THE PLAINTIFF IO UNABLE TO AFFORD COUNDEL
17	2. THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THIS CASE ARE COMPLEX
18	3. THE PLAINTIFF. AS IN SEGREGATION INMATE, HAS EXTREMELY LIMITED
·	ACLESS TO THE LAW LIBRARY.
19	4. OVER 30 DAYS AGO, THE PLAINTIFF WROTE LETTERS TO THREE ATTORNEYS.
20	HOLING THEN TO HANDLE HIS CASE BUT HE HAS NOT HEARD FROM
21	ANY OF THEM. 5. THE PLAINTIFF HAS A LIMITED KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAW.
22	WHERE FORE THE USING OF THE LAW.
23	WHEREFORE, THIS HONORABLE COURT SHOULD APPOINT COUNSEL
24	111
25	$n_{II}$
26	
27	

## DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

## BROWN SHIES:

- I. I AM THE PLHINTIFF IN THE IABOUE-ENTITLED CASE. I MAKE THIS DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MY MOTION FOR THIS APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL.
- 2. THE COMPLAINT IN THIS ZASE ALLEGES THAT THE PLAINTIFF WAS SUBJECTED TO THE MISUSE OF FORCE BY SEVERAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS, SOME OF WHOM ACTIVISH BEAT THE PLAINTIFF WHILE OTHERS WATCHED AND FAILED TO INTERVENE. IT ALLEGES THAT SUPERVISORY OFFICERS WERE AWARE OF THE VIOLENT PROPERSITIES OF SOME OF THE OFFICERS AND ARE LIABLE FOR FAILING TO TAKE ACTION TO CONTROL THEM. THE PLAINTIFF WAS SUBSEQUENTLY DEINED DUE PROCESS IN A DISCIPLINARY HEARING BY A HEARING OFFICER AND THE APPEAL WAS DEVISED BY THE WARDEN.
- 3. THIS IS A COMPLEX CASE BECAUSE IT CONTAINS SEVERAL DIFFRENT LEGAL ZLAIMS, WITH EACH ZLAIM INVOLVENG A DIFFRENT SET OF DEFENDANTS.
- 4. THE CLASE INVOLVES MEDICAL ISSUES THAT MAY REQUIRE EXPERT TESTIMONY.
- 5. THE PLAINTIFF TRAM HAS DEMANDED A JURY TRIAL
- 6. THE CASE WILL REQUIRE DISCOVERY OF DOCUMENTS AND DEPOSITIONS OF A NUMBER OF WITNESSES.
- 7. THE TESTIMONY WILL BE IN SHARP CONFLICT, SINCE THE PLAINTIFF ALLEGES THAT THE DEFENDANTS ASSAULTED HIM, WHILE THE DEFENDANTS ASSERTED THAT HE ASSAULTED THEM.
- 8. THE PLAINTIFF HAS ONLY A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION AND HAS NO LEGAL EDUCATION.
- 9. THE PLAINTIFF HAS SINCE BEEN TRANSFERED AND IS NOW SERVING A SENTENCE IN BOM MENTAL HEATLH SEUDEGATION. FOR THIS REASON HE HAS VERY CIMITED ACCESS TO LEGAL MATERIALS AND HAS NO ABNUTY ABILITY TO INVESTIGATE THE FACTS OF THE CASE, FOR EXEMPLE BY LOCATING AND INTERVIEW INGOTHER INMATES WHO WERE EYEWITNESSES TO HIS CLAIM.

10. AS SET FOR 4:16-CY-09603-HEG Document J. Filed 03/08/16 Page 3 of 7. THIS MOTION THESE FACTS, ALONG WITH THE LEGAL MGRIT OF PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS SUPPORT THE APPORENTMENT OF LOUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE PLAINTIFFI WHEREFORE, THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ZOUNSEL SHOULD BE GRANTED. PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C \$ 1746, I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT. GILD THIS 29th \_\_\_ DATOF\_Z\_\_\_,2016 5160 dan /10 MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL STATEMENT OF THE ZASE THIS RIS A CIVIL RIGHTS CASE FILED UNDER 42 U.S. 2 8 1983 BY A STATE PRISONER AND ASSERTING CLAIMS FOR THE UNITON STITUTIONAL MISUSE OF FORCE, THE DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS IN SUBSEQUENT DISCIPLINARY PROLECDINGS, AND THE DENIAL OF MEDICAL CARE FOR INJURIES INFLICTED DULING THE MISUSE OF FORCE. THE PLAINTIFF SEEKS DAMAGES AS TO HUL CLAIMS AND AN INJUNCTION. STATEMENT OF FACTS ( SEE: Altachment Titled! - Exhibit() STATE THE FACTS IN HERE THEN MOVED ARGUMENT

THE COURT SHOULD APPOINT COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF

IN DECIDING WHETHER TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR AN INDIGENT LITIGANT, THE ZOURT SHOULD CONSIDER"THE FACTUAL COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE. THE ABILITY OF THE IN DIBENT TO INVESTIGATE THE FACTS THE EXISTENCE OF CONFLICTING TETIMONY THE ABILITY OF THE INDIGENT TO PRESENT HIS CLAIM AND THE COMPLEXITY OF THE LEGAL ISSUSES, SEE MAN ABDULLAH V. GUNTER, 949 F. 2d 1032, 1035 (8+H CIR. 1991) (ZITATION OMITTED). IN ADDITION COURTS, HAVE SUGGESTED THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTUR IS WHETHER THE CASE APPEARS TO HAVE MERIT. SEE CARMONA V. U.S. BUREAU OF PRISONS, 243 F.3d (129, 632 (2d CIR, 2001), EACH OF THESE FACTORS WEIGHS IN FAVOR OF APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL IN THIS CASE.

1. FACTUAL COMPLEXITY. THE PLAINTIFF ALLEGES THAT SEVERAL COLLECTIONAL OFFICERS PHYSICALLY ABUSED HIM, WHILE OTHERS STOOD BY AND WATCHED HE ALSO ASSERTS THAT CERTAIN PRISON SUBERVISORS WERE ON

NOTICE OF THEASE 4:16-GY-POGOS-HSG DOCUMENT FILED 03/03/16 PAGE 4 OF THOSE OF FICENS AND DID NOTHING ABOUT THEM. THE SHEER NUMBER OF CLAIMS AND DEFENDANT MAKES THIS A FACTUALLY COMPLEX CASE.

2. THE PLAINTIFF'S ABILITY TO INVESTIGATE. THE PLAINTIFF IS LOCKED UP IN MENTAL HEALTH SEGREGATION AND HAS NO ABILITY TO INVESTIGATE THE FACTS. FOR EXAMPLE, HE IS LINABLE TO IDENTY IDENTIFY, LOCATE AND INTERVENU THE INMATES WHO SAW SOME OF ALL OF THE MISULE OF PORCE. HE IS IN THE SHILL SITUATION WITH REGARD TO DEVELOPING THE FACTS AS AN INMATE WHO HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED TO A DIFFERENT INSTITUTION, A FACTOR THAT SEVERAL COURTS HAVE CITED IN APPOINTING COUNSEL SEE TUZKER V. RANDALL, 948 F.2d 288, \$391-92 (7th Cir. 1991); GATSON V. COUCHLIN, 679 F. SUPP. 270, 273 (W.D.N.Y. 1988) IN ADDITION, THIS CASE WILL REQUIRE CONSIDERABLE DISCOURSE ZONCERNING THE IDENTITY OF WITNESSES, THE OFFICERS' REPORTS AND STATEMENTS ABOUT THE INCIDENT, ANY PRIOR HISTORY OF MISUSE OF FORCE 189 THE OFFICERS, KIND THE SEE BARHAM V. JOHNSON, 126 F. 32 454, 459 L32 CIR. 1997) [Holding courses SHOULD HAVE BEEN APPOINTED BECAUSE "PLISONER'S LACK OF LEGAL EXPERIENCE AND THE COMPLEX DISCOVERY DULES CLEARLY PUT HIM AT A DISADVANTAGE IN COUNTERING THE DEFENDANTS DISCOUERY TACTICS ... THESE [DISCOVERY] RULES PREVENTED ETHE PLAINTIFF FROM PRESENTING AN EFFECTIVE CASE BELOW.")

3. CONFLICTION TESTIMONY. THE PLAINTIFF'S ACCOUNT OF HIS BEATINGS BY OFFICERS IS SQUARELY IN CONFLICT WITH THE STATEMENTS OF THE OFFICERS. THIS ASPECT OF THE CASE WILL BE A CREDIBILITY ZONTEST BETWEEN THE DEFENDANTS AND THE PLAINTIFF (AND SIGHT INMARES WITNESSES AS CAN BE LOCATED). THE EXISTENCE OF THESE CREDIBILITY ISSUES SUPPORTS THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL, SEE STEELEY. SHAH, 87 F. 3d 1266, 1271 (11th CIR. 1996); GATGON V. COUCHLIN, 679 F. SUPP. AT 273.

LITHE ABILITY OF THE INDIGENT TO PRESENT HIS CLAIM. THE PLAINTIFF IS AN INDIGENT PRISONER WITH NO LEGAL TRATENING, A FACTOR THAT SUPPORTS THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL. SEE FORBES V. EDGAR, 112 F.3d 262, 264 (7th Cir. 1997). IN ADDITION, HE IS CONFINED TO MENTAL HEALTH SECRECATION WITH VERY IMITED ACCESS TO LEGAL MATERIALS, SEE RAYES V. JOHNSON, 969 F.2d 700, 703-04 (8th Cir. 1992) (CITING LACK FOR READY ACCESS TO ALAW LIBRARY AS A FACTOR SUPPORTING APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL).

J. LEGAL COMPLEXITY THE LAKE NUMBER OF DEFENDANTS, SOME OF WHOM ALB SUPERVISORY OFFICIALS, PRESENTS COMPLEX LEGAL ISSUES OF DETERMINING WHICH DEFENDANTS WERE SUFFICIENTLY PERSONALLY INVOLVED IN THE CONSTITUTIONIX VIOLATIONS TO BE HELD LIABLE. SEE HENDRICKS V. COUGHLIN, 114 F. 3d 390, 394 (2d CIR, 1997) (HOLDING COMPLEXITY OF SUPERVISORY LIABILITY SUPPORTED APPOINT MENT OF CONSEC). IN ADDITION, THE PLAINTIFF HAS ISKED FOR A JURY TRIAL I WHICH REQUIRES MUCH GREATER LEGAL SKILL THAN THE PLAINTIFF HAS OR CAN DEVELOP, SEE SOLIS V. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; 514 F.3d 946, 958 (4th CIR. 2008) (PASONER WITH EIGHTH GRADE EDIZATION AND NO LEGAL TRAINING IS "ILL SUITED" TO CONDUCT A JURY THAK).

O. MERIT GETHEGERSEGITHE PROMINENT FFJERDSUBJECT PROJED, CLEARLY WOULD ESTABLISH A CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION. THE UNPROJOKED AND INJURIOUS BEATING ALLEGED IN THE COMPLAINT CLEARLY STATES A EIGHTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION, SEE HUDSON V. MEMILLIAM 1503 U.S. 1, 1125. Ct. 995 (1992) ON ITS FACE, THEN THIS IS A MERITORIOUS CASE.

## CONCUSION

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, THE ZOURT SHOULD GRANT THE PLAINTIFF'S WIOTION AND APPOINT LOWISEL IN THIS CASE.

DATE 2-29-16

MANNE Simber E. Bound Is

PDDDESS & P.O. Box 7500 ASUP.B.S.P. Crescentaty, Ca 95532

· I Contribute To Peace editor (a) St banquiew · Com (2015)

PRISON	
E PR	
STATE	R.7
BAY	NH.
NY	-
PELICAN	

CDCR# 1581010				
P.O. BOX 7500 PBSP				
Crescenticity Ca 95532				
In Pro Per				
U.S. Dist Court	Northern Dist of California.			
IN RE:				
William E. Brown Ur	CASE NO.			
Petitioner,	ORIGINAL CASE NO. <u>CU6-663</u>			
on Habeas Corpus.	REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND DECLARATION OF INDIGENCY 42 4.5.C.\$ 1983 and 42 4.5.C.\$ 1981 etc.  Per \$ 2. Backes and incidents			
<b>1</b>	Holated (AEDFA)			
I, William F. Brown (mm) declare that I am a petitioner to the above-referenced				
matter, that I am incarcerated at PBSP IV ISO, and that I am indigent and unable to afford				
counsel. My total assets are \$ and my income is \$ per month.				
I hereby request that counsel be appointed in this matter so that my interests may be protected by				
the professional assistance required. In addition, when a court issues an order to show cause, counsel				
must be appointed for an indigent petitioner who requests counsel. California Rules of Court, Rule 4.551				
(c)(2).				
I declare under penalty of perjury that the forward executed on 2-29-16.	Petitioner			

William Ease 4:16-EV-00603-HSG Document 7 Filed 03/03/16 Page 7 of 7 PurBox 7500 PBSP ASU crescent city, ca 95532 U.S. Dist Court Northern Dist of California Cast # CU16-603 William E. Brawn, Jr Face Steet For State Plainliff ment of facts. For Appointment for Coursel Robert lasocco PBSP CRM, PBSP worden C.E. Ducart or refer to (Ashkerv. Gav) chaplain Alex V. LT. R. AMIS et al Defendants Maritars . 42 U.S. C. \$ 1983 and 42 U.S. C.\$ 1981 etc. 8 pers 2. (Budges and FACE SHEET FOR STATEMENT incidents (violated (ADDA) 9 OF FACTS 10 11 Plaintiff Asserts THE following Defendants Named are Being Swed in their individual Capacity and at All times they are named as respon. 12 Bible Actors Acting under the color of the law. A.) Staff Involved Acted or Knew of THE following lincerted efforts in Collision imposed upon plaintiff Character Ula a Campaign of Harassment with the "evil" or putricl intent to retaliate, use force, and violated other Coust. Due process In violation of the Agreement of the Case regarding (Ashker V. Gou) Case # 4:09-60-08796-CW etc. B.) Robert la socco Delican Buy State prison Com munity Resource Manager (CRM), warden C.E. Ducart of (PBSP), Chaplain Alex Valuiski, PBSP LT.R. Amis, LT. L. Kirby, LT. J. Berg, Sof. M. powers, Go J. Dickerson, do. 18 U. Taylor, Go. L. Butierrez, C/O A. Maylon, C/O S. Nelson, C/O S. Rexford, do C. Salas, LUND. MORINSKI, LCSN CINDY FOX, LT. T. Buch anon, co Trevino relired AS Black, LT. Kevin Bond Refired ASU, Clo. M. 20 Servior, Servior baulibrary Staff E. Mc Cum sey, facility Captum K.C. Getz, LT. Frisk of Asis, et al c.) These officials know of or participated or failed to Act when:

plaintiff 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 13th, 14th U.S. Govot. California Const. universal Declaration of Human Rights, U.N. 23 Mandeja Reles, (Ashker V, Gov) Agreement. · " Badges and incidents per 52." 42 U.S.C. \$1981 Triggered YAEDPA) violations Based on Plaintiffs Race and religion 25 or promoting THE Agreement. THESE Officials Have engaged in a Compaign of Harassment, used excessive force, Retaliated and Fabricated reports to "uphold" Blue & Green war Code of Silence Against 27 New Afrikan" Plaintiff and THE United K. A.G.E. Brothers & SISTERS (Religions activity Group) To promote The Agreement To End All Hostilities Date: 2-29-16 (S/AMa /A) SPATT